# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

### FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PAUL M. FARRAR,

06-CV-442-JE

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

CITY OF ASTORIA, STEPHEN WINSTEAD, and WINSTEAD AND ASSOCIATES,

Defendants.

#### DAVID C. FORCE

96 E. Broadway, Suite 2 P.O. Box 10972 Eugene, OR 97440 (541) 343-2956

Attorney for Plaintiff

# GERALD L. WARREN

280 Liberty Street SE, Suite 206 Salem, OR 97301 (503) 480-7252

Attorney for Defendants

## BROWN, Judge.

Magistrate Judge John Jelderks issued Findings and Recommendation (#40) on December 29, 2006, in which he recommended this Court grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#25). Plaintiff Paul M. Farrar filed timely objections to the Findings and Recommendation. The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate

Judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make

a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's

report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). See also United States v.

Bernhardt, 840 F.2d 1441, 1444 (9th Cir. 1988); McDonnell Douglas

Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach., Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th

Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

This Court has reviewed the record de novo, including
Plaintiff's objections, and concludes the Magistrate Judge
properly found (1) Plaintiff's substantive due-process claim is
preempted by the Fifth Amendment takings clause and is not ripe;
(2) Defendants did not deny Plaintiff equal protection; (3) there
is not any evidence in the record of a final decision by
Defendants as to Plaintiff's application for a building permit,
and, therefore, Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on
Plaintiff's state-law claim for breach of a duty to provide a

building permit; and (4) the Court should dismiss Plaintiff's state common-law claim with prejudice. The Court does not find any error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation.

### CONCLUSION

The Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Jelderks's Findings and Recommendation (#40). Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#25).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2007.

/s/ Anna J. Brown

ANNA J. BROWN United States District Judge